



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,077	08/30/2006	Norishige Emoto	1033318-000034	5955
21839	7590	08/04/2011	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				CORBO, NICHOLAS T
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2427				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/591,077	EMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS CORBO	2427	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2011.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 06/08/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to Applicant's argument on pages 2-3 of Applicant's Remarks alleging DeMoney does not disclose "the playlist designating a time for displaying digital static image video information" because "DeMoney only discloses the use of a schedule for playing movies", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. DeMoney discloses the notoriously well known concept of a playlist being used to order events into a sequence as seen in the rejection below. While DeMoney does not specifically mention static images being included in the playlist, Bishop has already disclosed the ordering of the display of static images. The playlist of DeMoney applied to the system of Bishop, as seen in the combination in the rejection below, is interpreted by the Examiner to cover the limitations of claim 1. Furthermore, a movie, as seen in DeMoney, is very typically a multitude of static images/frames quickly and sequentially displayed (e.g., 30 frames/images per second in analog NTSC, 25 frames/images per second in analog PAL) to portray full motion video.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4-6, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art Oki et al (hereinafter referred to as Oki) JP 2002209193A in view of Bishop et al (hereinafter referred to as Bishop) US 4910683, and further in view of DeMoney US 6064379.

Referring to claim 1, Oki discloses a video information distribution and display system comprising:

a video information distribution device that distributes and outputs video information including dynamic image video information and processed digital static image video information, and an image control signal (**see Paragraph 0012 for disclosing a video information distribution device distributing animation/dynamic image video information and processed/compressed (see Paragraph 0025 for disclosing the still pictures are transmitted after carrying out data compression) digital static image/still picture video information, and see Paragraph 0016 and 0032 for disclosing the image control signal)**) for disclosing ; and

a video information receiving and display device that receives and displays the video information (**see Paragraphs 0012-0015 for disclosing the train loading/receiving video information distribution display system**), wherein

Oki is unclear as to the display device restores in advance a state before processing of processed digital static image video information of a next static image to be displayed, in accordance with an instruction of the image control signal, and stands

by for the next display and a schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data which specifies an order and duration of displaying the content to be displayed.

Bishop discloses a display device restores in advance a state before processing of processed digital static image video information of a next static image to be displayed, in accordance with an instruction of the image control signal, and stands by for the next display (**see Col. 5, Line 6-29 for disclosing the next image to be displayed is restored/rendered into the display buffer that is not being displayed/standing by for next display in accordance with an instruction of a image control signal).**

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the known technique of double buffering images of Bishop with the system of Oki in order to improve the displaying of images by avoiding the need to recalculate and redisplay all points comprising the displayed image any time a change of the relative viewpoint of the data is request by a user (**see Bishop, Col. 1, Lines 13-36**).

Oki in view of Bishop is unclear as to a schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data which specifies an order and duration of displaying the content to be displayed.

DeMoney discloses a schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data which specifies an order and duration of displaying the content to be displayed (**see Fig. 2 and Col. 4, Lines 44-49 for**

disclosing generation of multimedia content is controlled on the basis of schedule data/playlist which specifies an order and duration of displaying the content).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the playlist of DeMoney with the system of Oki in view of Bishop in order to allow a system operator to flexibly specify the manner in which admission delays (the delay between the time when the play of a particular title on a playlist is commanded and the actual initiation of play) are accounted for to compensate for (**see DeMoney, Col. 2, Lines 11-14 and 30-31**).

Referring to claim 2, Oki discloses the dynamic image video information is transmitted via a first transmission line and the processed digital static image video information is transmitted via a second transmission (**see Paragraph 0012**).

Referring to claim 4, Oki in view of Bishop discloses the video information distribution and display system as seen in the rejection of claim 1.

Bishop further comprises first and second storage (buffer) areas, wherein static image data of each image to be displayed is restored and stored in a sequential alternative fashion in one of the first storage area or the second storage area (**see Fig. 1 and Col. 5, Line 6-29 for disclosing the first (A) and second (B) storage areas/display buffers attached to the display system 30 wherein the still images**

are restored/rendered and stored into the display buffers in a sequential alternative fashion/double buffering technique between each buffer).

Referring to claim 5, Oki in view of Bishop discloses the video information distribution and display system as seen in the rejection of claim 1.

Bishop further discloses the display device further comprises the sequential alternative fashion that determines an order of storage in one of the first storage area or the second storage area is determined from content designation information contained in the image control signal (**see Col. 5, Lines 22-29 for disclosing the image control signal determines the sequential alternating selection of the display buffers for display, and consequently storage).**

Referring to claim 6, Oki discloses the video information distribution and display system further comprises the processed digital static image video information includes information for displaying a greater image resolution than the dynamic image video information (**see Paragraphs 0025-0027 for disclosing the still image are capable of displaying at a greater image resolution than the moving/dynamic image video information).**

Referring to claim 8, Oki in view of Bishop discloses the video information distribution and display system including the video information receiving and display device as seen in the rejection of claim 1.

Bishop further discloses the display device comprises two storage areas for storing the static image to be displayed, and the static image to be displayed the next time is previously stored to any one of the storage areas (**see Fig. 1 and Col. 5, Line 6-29 for disclosing the first (A) and second (B) storage areas/display buffers attached to the display system 30 wherein the still images are restored/rendered and stored into the display buffers in a sequential alternative fashion/double buffering technique between each buffer**).

Referring to claim 9, Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney discloses the video information distribution and display system as seen in the rejection of claim 1.

Bishop further discloses wherein a duration of displaying of each segment of the video information is a duration longer than a duration for the segment to be stored to one of the storage areas by returning the segment to a state before the processed digital static image video information is processed in the video information receiving and display device (**see Col. 5, Line 61 – Col. 6, Line 3**).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art Oki et al (hereinafter referred to as Oki) JP 2002209193A in view of Bishop et al (hereinafter referred to as Bishop) US 4910683, further in view of DeMoney US 6064379, and further in view of Potrebic et al (hereinafter referred to as Potrebic) US 6804824.

Referring to claim 3, Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney discloses the limitations of claim 1 including the video information distribution device, the processed digital static image video information, the dynamic image video information, and the distribution and output of the information, and the video information receiving and display device.

Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney fails to disclose the video information distribution device multiplexes the processed digital static image video information to the dynamic image video information, and the video information receiving and display device demultiplexes the processed digital static image video information from the multiplexed dynamic image video information.

Potrebic et al discloses the video information distribution device multiplexes the processed digital static image video information to the dynamic image video information (**see Col. 1, Lines 29-33 for disclosing all digital programming including both types of video information being multiplexed together by the provider/distribution device**), and the video information receiving and display device demultiplexes the processed digital static image video information from the multiplexed dynamic image video information (**see Col. 1, Lines 33-36 and Col. 7, Lines 50-63 for disclosing the multiplexed data is identifiably packetized so that when demultiplexed at the client set top box/receiving and display device they are separated from the other data that they were multiplexed with at the provider**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the known technique of multiplexing and demultiplexing before transmission of various types of data over a single transmission line of a network of Potrebic with the known system of Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney in order to take advantage of the well known technique to predictably improve the system by reducing the number of transmission paths needed to deliver the data to each receiver.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oki et al (hereinafter referred to as Oki) JP 2002209193A in view of Bishop et al (hereinafter referred to as Bishop) US 4910683, further in view of DeMoney US 6064379, and further in view of Duso et al (hereinafter referred to as Duso) US 6625750.

Referring to claim 10, Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney discloses the schedule management section and the video information receiving and display device limitations as seen in the rejection of claim 1.

Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney is unclear as to in a case where video information not included in the schedule data is to be displayed, the schedule management section generate an interrupt image control signal for displaying the video information not included in the schedule data, and outputs an interrupt image control signal to the video information receiving and display device that is collated with schedule data

Duso discloses in a case where video information not included in the schedule data is to be displayed, generation of an interrupt image control signal for displaying the video information not included in the schedule data, and output of an interrupt image control signal to the device that is collated with schedule data (**see Figs. 34-35 and Col. 45, Line 25 – Col. 48, Line 39 for disclosing when video information not included in the schedule (“one or more clips” not in the original playlist created in step 422) an interrupt image control signal for displaying the clips not included in the playlist/schedule can be generated and sent to the display device (step 423 to 424) to insert the clips not originally included into the schedule).**)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the known technique of inserting events into a previously set schedule with the known system of Oki in view of Bishop, and further in view of DeMoney in order to predictably improve the system by allowing the convenience of dynamically revising the play-list during broadcast with new material (**see Duso, Col. 48, Lines 22-26**).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 11 is allowed for the same reasons disclosed in the office action dated 01/06/2010.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS CORBO whose telephone number is (571)270-5675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 900am-530pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on (571)272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.T.C. 07/28/2011
Examiner, Art Unit 2427

/Scott Beliveau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427